# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

Serial Number	09/887,413	
Confirmation Number	8942	
Filing Date	06/21 2001	
Title of Application	Personal centralized alert delivery systems and methods of use	
First Named Inventor	Yi-Min Wang	
Assignee	Microsoft Corporation	
Group Art Unit	2164	
Examiner	AL HASHEMI, SANA A	
Attorney Docket Number	MS1-0752US	
Nature of this Document	Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment under 37 CFR § 1.181	

To:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria VA 22313-1450

From:

Kayla D. Brant (Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)

Customer No. 22801

# Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment under 37 CFR § 1.181

Applicant contends that the Notice of Abandonment regarding the above-mentioned application was issued in error. Accordingly, this petition under 37 CFR § 1.181(a) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment is being filed. The petition under 37 CFR § 1.181, to withdraw the holding of abandonment, is being filed within 2 months of the mailing date of the Notice of Abandonment (May 13, 2008) and is therefore filed in a timely manner under 37 CFR § 1.181(f).

Serial No.: «ptsumm\_appserial»

Atty Docket No.: «matter\_cltcode»-«matter\_matcode»

Atty/Agent: «matter\_billatty\_name»



-1-

The following evidence is submitted herewith to prove that the Notice of Abandonment was issued erroneously:

- 1. A copy of pages 1 and 17 of the Decision on Appeal dated February 21, 2008. which indicates that the Applicant has the option to re-open prosecution by submitting, within 2 months, "an appropriate amendment of the claims so rejected or new evidence relating to the claims so rejected, or both, and have the matter reconsidered by the examiner, in which event the proceeding will be remanded to the examiner".
- 2. A copy of the Amendment as filed through the Electronic Filing System on April 21, 2008 including the acknowledgement receipt dated the same day.

This evidence proves that Applicant filed an appropriate amendment of the claims within the 2 months from the date of the Decision on Appeal. Accordingly, based on the Decision on Appeal. prosecution should have been reopened. Based on the evidence submitted herewith, Applicant requests that prosecution be reopened, and the Amendment submitted on April 21, 2008 be entered.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Representatives for Applicant

Kayla D. Brant (kayla@leehayes.com; x242)

Registration No. 46576

Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com

IEE Shaves The Business of IP\* www.leehaves.com 509.324.9256

Dated: <u>6/13/08</u>

1	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2	
3	
4	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5	AND INTERFERENCES
6	
7	
8	Ex parte YI-MIN WANG, PARAMVIR BAHL,
9	and WILF G. RUSSELL
10	
11	1 2007 2200
12	Appeal 2007-2388
13	Application 09/887,413 <sup>1</sup>
14 15	Technology Center 2100
16	
17	Decided: February 19, 2008
18	Decided, 1 cordary 19, 2008
19	
20	
21Be	efore LANCE LEONARD BARRY, HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, and
22C	AROLYN D. THOMAS, Administrative Patent Judges.
23	
24TI	HOMAS, C., Administrative Patent Judge.
25	
26	DECISION ON APPEAL
27	
28	
29	

<sup>1</sup> Application filed June 21, 2001. The real party in interest is Microsoft 2Corporation.

72Appeal 2007-2388 73Application 09/887,413 74
1
2 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(b)
3 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(b) provides that, "[a] new ground of rejection
4pursuant to this paragraph shall not be considered final for judicial review."
5 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(b) also provides that the Appellants, WITHIN TWO
6MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THE DECISION, must exercise one of the
7following two options with respect to the new grounds of rejection to avoid
8termination of proceedings (37 C.F.R. § 1.197 (b) as to the rejected claims):
(1) Reopen prosecution. Submit an appropriate amendment of the claims so rejected or new evidence relating to the claims so rejected, or both, and have the matter reconsidered by the examiner, in which event the proceeding will be remanded to the examiner
(2) Request rehearing. Request that the proceeding be reheard under 37 C.F.R. § 41.52 by the Board upon the same record
7 VIII. CONCLUSIONS
We conclude that Appellants have not shown that the Examiner erred
9in rejecting the claims.
Thus, claims 1-42 are not patentable.
However, since we have entered a new ground of rejection against
2claims 35-42, our decision is not a final agency action.
3
4
IX. DECISION
5 17

### **Acknowledgement Receipt**

The USPTO has received your submission at 17:49:03 Eastern Time on 21-APR-2008 .

No fees have been paid for this submission. Please remember to pay any required fees on time to prevent abandonment of your application.

eFiled Application Information		
EFS ID	3185236	
Application Number	09887413	
Confirmation Number	8942	
Title	Personal centralized alert delivery systems and methods of use	
First Named Inventor	Yi-Min Wang	
Customer Number or Correspondence Address	22801	
Filed By	NingNing Xu/Carly Bokarica	
Attorney Docket Number	MS1-752US	
Filing Date	21-JUN-2001	
Receipt Date	21-APR-2008	
Application Type	Utility under 35 USC 111 (a)	

Ă١	nni	lica	tion	De	tail	s
-	v.	IIVU	CIVII		LUII	

Submitted Files	Page Count	Document Description	File Size	Warnii	ngs
\$45C- 208042111210.pdf	31 64		48004 bytes	3004 bytes 🚸 PASS	
	Docu	ment Description	Page Sta	art	Page End
	Miscel	laneous Incoming Letter		1	1
	Amen	dment/Argument after BPAI Decision		2	31

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

#### If you need help:

- Call the Patent Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197 (toll free) or e-mail EBC@uspto.gov for specific questions about Patent e-Filing.
- Send general questions about USPTO programs to the USPTO Contact Center (UCC).
- If you experience technical difficulties or problems with this application, please report them via e-mail to Electronic Business Support or call 1 800-786-9199.

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.	09/887.413
Filing Date	6/21/2001
Confirmation No.	8942
First Named Inventor	Yi-Min Wang
Assignee	Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit	2164
Examiner	Samuel G Rimell
Attorney's Docket No.	MS1-0752US
Title: Personal centralized alert delivery systems and methods	of use

To: Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

From: Kayla D. Brant (Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)

Customer Number: 22801 Lee & Hayes, PLLC

421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500

Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 04/21/08

Fees will be paid by credit card through the EFS Web; however the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency of fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number 12-0769.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:

1

Kayla D. Brant Reg. No. 46576

(509) 324-9256

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

Serial Number	09/887,413
Confirmation Number	8942
Filing Date	06/21 2001
Title of Application	Personal centralized alert delivery systems and methods of use
First Named Inventor	Yi-Min Wang
Assignee	Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit	2164
Examiner	Samuel G Rimell
Attorney Docket Number	MS1-0752US
Nature of the Office Communication to which this is responding	Appeal Decision
Date of the Office Communication	02/19/2008
Nature of this Document	Amendment

To:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria VA 22313-1450

From:

Kayla D. Brant (Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)

Customer No. 22801

### Brief Summary of Selected Substantive Portions of this Response

[0001] Amendments are presented herein that address the new § 101 rejections raised by the Board of Appeals. Amendments are also presented here based on the reasoning provided by the Board of Appeals for affirming the Examiner's § 102 rejections of claims 1-42.

[0002] This brief summary is not intended to represent the Applicant's full response to the Action. Rather, it is merely a brief summary of selected substantive portions of the response herein.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant



# **SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS**

None

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant



# **CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

### Claim Amendment Summary

### Claims pending

- Before this Amendment: Claims 1-42.
- After this Amendment: Claims 1-42

Non-Elected, Canceled, or Withdrawn claims: None

Amended claims: 1-5, 7-14, 16, 18-22, 24-26, 28, 30, and 32-42

New claims: None

#### Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:

receiving at a centralized alert center, a user-submitted indication of an alert source from which a user desires to receive alerts, wherein:

the centralized alert center is not directly associated with the alert source; and

the alert source is configured to enable users to subscribe directly to the alert source;

subscribing, by the centralized alert center, on behalf of the user, to the alert source, such that alerts for the user are sent by the alert source to the centralized alert center rather than to the user:

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP \*\*
www.leelinges.com 508 324 9256

receiving at the centralized alert center, on behalf of the user, an alert for a-the

user, and on behalf of the user, from one of multiple alert source; the alert source;

mapping the alert that was received to a delivery mode; and

based on the mapping, forwarding the same alert that was received transmitting

the alert-to the user according to the delivery mode.

2. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein mapping

the alert that was received to a delivery mode further-comprises mapping the alert

according to the alert source-of the alert.

3. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein mapping

the alert that was received to the delivery mode further comprises mapping the alert

according to content of the alert-content.

4. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the

delivery mode specifies a delivery method used to deliver-forward the same alert that was

received to the user, and wherein the transmitting further forwarding the same aiert that

was received to the user according to the delivery mode comprises transmitting the same

alert that was received to the user via the delivery method indicated in the delivery mode.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee&hayes The Business of IP \*\*

-5-

(Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the delivery mode specifies a delivery action that indicates a delivery method to be used to deliver forward the same alert that was received and whether an acknowledgement to the alert should be expected, and the method further comprises waiting for an

acknowledgement to the alert if the delivery mode indicates that an acknowledgement to

the alert should be expected.

5.

(Original) The method as recited in claim 5, wherein the delivery action 6.

specifies a time period to wait for an acknowledgement if an acknowledgement to the

alert is expected, and wherein the waiting further comprises waiting the specified time

period for an acknowledgement to the alert.

7. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

the delivery mode further-specifies a first delivery method used to deliver-forward

the same alert that was received;

the delivery mode further specifies a second delivery method used to deliver

forward the same alert that as received;

the second delivery method is different than the first delivery method; and

forwarding the same alert that was received the transmitting further comprises

transmitting the same alert that was received to the user via the first delivery method and

the second delivery method as indicated by the delivery mode.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@haves The Business of IP™ erow leabayes com 508,334,9256

-6-

8. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the mapping the alert that was received to a delivery mode further-comprises:

defining one or more categories of alerts;

assigning a delivery mode to each category; and

categorizing the alert, thereby mapping the alert to the delivery mode of the category.

9. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 8, wherein mapping the alert that was received to a delivery mode further comprising assigning a priority to each category, and wherein the assigning a delivery mode to cach category further comprises assigning a delivery mode to a category based on the priority assigned to the category.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP \*\*

10. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

mapping the alert that was received to the delivery mode further-comprises:

mapping the alert that was received to a primary delivery block specifying a

first delivery action that specifies a first delivery method, and a secondary delivery

block specifying a second delivery action that specifies a second delivery method,

wherein the second delivery method is not the same as the first delivery method;

and

transmitting forwarding the alert that was received to the user according to the

delivery mode further-comprises:

transmitting the alert that was received to the user according to the first

delivery action; and

if transmitting the alert that was received to the user according to the first

delivery action is successful, preventing the alert that was received from being

transmitted to the user according to the second delivery action; and

if transmitting the alert that was received to the user according to the first

delivery action is unsuccessful, transmitting the alert that was received to the user

according to the second delivery action if transmitting the alert to the user

according to the first delivery action is unsuccessful.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent; Kayla D. Brant

Peel hayes The Business of IP \*\*

-8-

11. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 10, wherein the

first and second delivery actions each further specify indicate a delivery method to be

used to deliver the alert and whether an acknowledgement to the alert should be expected,

and the method further comprises:

waiting for an acknowledgement to the transmission of the alert according to the

first delivery action if the first delivery action indicates specifies that an

acknowledgement to the alert should be expected; and

waiting for an acknowledgement to the transmission of the alert according to the

second delivery action if the second delivery action indicates specifies that an

acknowledgement to the alert should be expected, provided the alert is transmitted

according to the secondary delivery action.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP \*\*

vany leatinges con | 509-324 9256

\_0\_

12. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 10, wherein:

the first delivery action further specifies a indicates first and second-third delivery

methods method, wherein the third delivery method is not the same as the first delivery

method; and

if transmitting the alert that was received to the user according to the first delivery

action is unsuccessful, transmitting the alert that was received to the user according to the

second delivery action comprises determining that transmitting the alert that was received

to the user according to the first delivery action is unsuccessful the transmitting the alert

to-the user according to the second delivery action further comprises transmitting the alert

to the user according to the second-delivery action if either the first delivery method or

the second-third delivery method indicated in the first delivery action fails to result in

transmission of the alert that was received to the user.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee hayes The Business of (P\*\*)

13. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 10, wherein:

each of the first and second delivery actions further-eomprises specifies:

a delivery method to be used to deliver the alert:

whether an acknowledgement to the alert should be expected; and

a time period to wait for an acknowledgement if an acknowledgement to

the alert is should be expected; and

the method further comprises:

waiting for an acknowledgement to the transmission of the alert according

to the fist delivery action if the first delivery action indicates that an

acknowledgement to the alert is expected; and

waiting for an acknowledgement to the transmission of the alert according

to the second delivery action if the second delivery action indicates that an

acknowledgement to the alert is expected, provided that the alert was transmitted

according to the secondary delivery action.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

14. (Currently Amended) The method as recited in claim 10, wherein the

primary delivery block and the secondary delivery block each specify a first delivery

action that indicates a first delivery method to be used to deliver the alert and whether an

acknowledgement to the alert should be expected, and a second delivery action that

indicates a second delivery method, which is different than the first delivery method, to

be used to deliver the alert and whether an acknowledgement to the alert should be

expected, the method further comprising:

waiting for an acknowledgement to the transmission of the alert according to each

delivery action of the primary delivery block that indicates that an acknowledgement to

the alert should be expected; and

waiting for an acknowledgement to the transmission of the alert according to each

delivery action of the secondary delivery block that indicates that an acknowledgement to

the alert should be expected, provided the alert is transmitted according to the delivery

actions of the secondary delivery block.

15. (Original) The method as recited in claim 14, wherein each delivery action

that indicates to wait for an acknowledgement specifies a time period to wait for an

acknowledgement, and wherein waiting for an acknowledgement further comprises

-12-

waiting the specified time period for an acknowledgement.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP\*\*

(Currently Amended) A centralized alert delivery system, comprising: 16.

an input/output (I/O) module configured to receive alerts from multiple alert

sources, wherein:

each of the multiple alert sources is configured to enable users to subscribe

to receive alerts directly from the alert source; and

the centralized alert delivery system is configured as an intermediary that

enables a user to direct the centralized alert delivery system to subscribe to receive

alerts directly from the multiple alert sources on behalf of the user, thereby

enabling the user to receive alerts from the alert source without providing any user

contact information to the alert source:

a mapping module configured to map an alert received on behalf of a user from

one of the multiple alert sources to a delivery mode; and

a communications layer that interfaces to one or more communications modules,

the communications layer being configured to receive the mapped alert and deliver the

alert to the user via a communications module according to the delivery mode associated

with the alert.

(Original) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in claim 16. 17.

wherein the mapping module is further configured to map the alert according to the

source of the alert.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

IEE&haves The Business of IP" rows tenhayes rum 509 324 9256

-13-

18. (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in claim 16, wherein the alert further comprises content, and wherein the mapping module is further configured to map the alert according to the content of the alert.

19. (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 16, wherein the delivery mode specifies a delivery action that indicates a delivery

method by which an alert associated with mapped to the delivery mode is transmitted.

20. (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 19, wherein the delivery method is chosen from one of the following a group of

delivery methods consisting of: e-mail, instant messaging, SMS (short message service)

messaging.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

21. (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 16, wherein the delivery mode further-comprises one or more delivery blocks, each

delivery block including specifying one or more delivery actions, each delivery action

specifying:

a delivery method by which an alert associated with the delivery mode is

transmitted delivered;

whether an acknowledgement to the alert is expected; and

if an acknowledgement to the alert is expected, a time to wait for the

acknowledgement.

22: (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 16, wherein the delivery mode further comprises one or more delivery blocks, each

delivery block including specifying one or more delivery actions, each delivery action

specifying a delivery method by which the associated alert is transmitted delivered and

whether an acknowledgement to the transmitted alert is expected.

23. (Original) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in claim 22,

wherein each delivery action that indicates an acknowledgement is expected further

specifies a time to wait for the acknowledgement.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

<sub>-</sub>15-

(Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in 24.

claim 16, wherein:

the delivery mode further-comprises a primary delivery block and a secondary

delivery block; and

the communications layer is further configured to:

deliver the alert to the user via the one or more communications modules

according to a delivery method specified in the primary delivery block;

-and, if delivery according to the primary delivery block fails, to-deliver the

alert according to a delivery method specified in the secondary delivery block; and

if delivery according to the primary delivery block succeeds, preventing the

alert from being delivered according to the delivery method specified in the

secondary delivery block.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@haiveS The Business of IP" 

25. (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 16, wherein:

the delivery mode further-comprises a primary delivery block that includes a first

delivery action that specifies a first delivery method and a second delivery action that

specifies a second delivery method, wherein the second delivery method is different than

the first delivery method; and

the communications layer is further configured to deliver the alert via the one or

more communications modules according to the first delivery method specified in the

first delivery action and according to the second delivery method specified in the second

delivery action.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee&hayes The Business of IP\*\*

www.leutinyes.com 509-324-3256

-17-

26. (Currently Amended) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 25, wherein:

the delivery mode further comprises a secondary delivery block; and

the communications layer is further configured to delivery:

deliver the alert via the one or more communications modules according to

a delivery method specified in the secondary delivery block if the delivery of the

alert according to either the first delivery action or the second delivery action in

the primary delivery block fails; and

prevent delivery of the alert via the one or more communications modules

according to a delivery method specified in the secondary delivery block if the

delivery of the alert according to the primary delivery block succeeds.

27. (Previously presented) The centralized alert delivery system as recited in

claim 16, further comprising:

a categories module that identifies categories into which an alert may be

categorized, wherein each category has an associated delivery mode; and

the mapping module is further configured to categorize the alert into a category

identified in the categories module thereby associating the alert with the delivery mode of

the category.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

-18-

28. (Currently Amended) A computer system, comprising:

a processor;

an I/O module;

memory; and

an alert center stored in the memory, the alert center including:

a subscription layer configured to;

receive a request from a user to subscribe to a particular alert source

on behalf of the user, wherein the alert source is not directly affiliated with

the alert center;

subscribe to the particular alert source on behalf of the user:

receive an alert from an-the alert source and assign a delivery mode

to the alert; and

a communications layer configured to transmit the same alert that was

received to the user according to a delivery mode assigned to the alert.

29. (Original) The computer system as recited in claim 28, wherein the alert

center is further configured to monitor for an acknowledgement that the alert was

successfully delivered.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP\*\*

30. (Currently Amended) The computer system as recited in claim 28, wherein the alert center is further configured to monitor for an acknowledgement that the alert was successfully delivered according to a first delivery method associated with the delivery mode and, if an acknowledgment is not received within a specified time period, assign a backup delivery method to the alert and attempt to deliver the alert according to the backup delivery method, wherein the backup delivery method is different than the first delivery method.

31. (Original) The computer system as recited in claim 28, wherein:

the delivery mode further comprises a primary delivery block having a first delivery action and a second delivery action; and

the communications layer is further configured to transmit the alert according to the first delivery action and the second delivery action of the primary delivery block.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee&hayes The Business of IP \*\*

32. (Currently Amended) The computer system as recited in elaim 31 claim

28, wherein:

the delivery mode further comprises a primary delivery block having a delivery

action and a secondary delivery block having a delivery action; and

the communications layer is further configured to transmit the alert according to

the delivery action of the primary delivery block and, if delivery of the alert according to

the primary delivery block fails, to transmit the alert according to the delivery action of

the secondary delivery block.

33. (Currently Amended) The computer system as recited in claim 31,

wherein:

the delivery action of the primary delivery block is a first-delivery action;

the-primary delivery block further comprises a second delivery action;

the first delivery action and the second delivery action further comprise a time to

wait for an acknowledgement that the alert was received; and

the communications layer is further configured to transmit the alert according to

the delivery action of the secondary delivery block if an acknowledgement to the

transmission of the alert according to the first delivery action or the second delivery

action of the primary delivery block is not received with within the time to wait identified

by the first delivery action and the second delivery action, respectively.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP \*\*\*

-21-

34. (Currently Amended) The computer system as recited in claim 28,

wherein:

the subscription layer further comprises comprises:

a categories module that includes one or more categories into which an alert

may be categorized, each category having a delivery mode associated therewith;

and

the subscription layer further comprises a mapping module configured to

categorize an alert received from an alert source, thereby associating the delivery

mode of the category with the alert.

35. (Currently Amended) One or more computer-readable-computer storage

media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer,

perform the following direct the computer to perform a method comprising:

subscribing to an alert source on behalf of a user, wherein the alert source is

configured to enable users to subscribe to receive alerts directly from the alert source:

receiving, on behalf of the user, an alert from one of a plurality of alert sources the

alert source;

determining a delivery mode which specifies a delivery method by which the alert

should be forwarded to a-the user; and

transmitting the same alert that was received to the user according to the delivery

mode.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP to

-22-

36. (Currently Amended) The one or more computer-readable computer

storage media as recited in claim 35, wherein the determining a primary the delivery

mode further-comprises:

determining the alert source from which the alert originated;

identifying a category associated with the alert source; and

identifying a delivery mode associated with the category.

37. (Currently Amended) The one or more computer-readable-computer

storage media as recited in claim 35, wherein the transmitting the alert further according

to the delivery mode comprises:

identifying a delivery action associated with the delivery mode; and

transmitting the alert according to the delivery action.

38. (Currently Amended) The one or more computer-readable-computer

storage media as recited in claim 35, wherein the transmitting the alert further according

to the delivery mode comprises:

identifying a first delivery action associated with the delivery mode;

identifying a second delivery action associated with the delivery mode; and

transmitting the alert according to the first delivery action and the second delivery

action.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP "

-23-

39. (Currently Amended) The one or more computer readable computer

storage media as recited in claim 35, wherein:

the delivery mode further-comprises a primary delivery block that specifies one or

more delivery actions, and a secondary delivery block that specifies one or more delivery

actions; and

the transmitting the alert to the user according to the delivery mode further

comprises transmitting the alert to the user according to the delivery action of the primary

delivery block and, if the transmission according to the delivery action of the primary

delivery block fails, transmitting the alert to the user according to the delivery action of

the secondary delivery block.

40. (Currently Amended) The one or more emputer-readable-computer

storage media as recited in claim 39, wherein:

the primary delivery block comprises first and second delivery actions; and

the transmission of the alert according to the primary delivery block is deemed to

fail if the transmission of the alert according to the first or second delivery actions fails.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

-24-

lee@hayes The Business of IP 19

41. (Currently Amended) The one or more computer readable computer storage media as recited in claim 39, wherein:

the primary delivery block comprises first and second delivery actions; and

the transmission of the alert according to the primary delivery block is deemed to fail if the transmission of the alert according to both the first and second delivery actions fails.

42. (Currently Amended) The one or more computer readable computer storage media as recited in claim 35, wherein the method further comprising comprises monitoring for an acknowledgement that the alert was successfully received by the user.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

**REMARKS** 

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims

of the application. Claims 1-42 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are: 1-5,

7-14, 16, 18-22, 24-26, 28, 30, and 32-42. No claim are added, withdrawn, or cancelled

herein.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0003] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than

allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner.

I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—

so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and

efficiently over the phone.

[0004] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that

is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call

as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0005] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of

expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1-5, 7-14, 16, 18-22, 24-26, 28, 30, and

32-42 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments

are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter.

Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be

construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited reference.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP\*\*

-26-

[0006] Support for the claim amendments presented herein may be found at least at the following locations of the specification, as originally filed: Summary, paragraph 3; Fig. 3; Fig. 9; page 16-17; and pages 20-21.

# Substantive Matters

### Claim Rejections under § 101

[0007] Claims 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Furthermore, in light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of §101 and that the §101 rejections should be withdrawn.

In issuing the 101 rejection, the Board indicates that claims 35-42 each recite "computer-readable media" and that the specification states that the "computer-readable media may comprise... communications media"..." (Decision on Appeal, page 15.) Claims 35-42 have each been amended to recite "computer storage media", rather than "computer-readable media". On page 14 of the specification, a distinction is made between "communications media" and "computer storage media" – each of which may be considered "computer readable media". Computer storage media is not described as including carrier waves or signals. Accordingly, Applicant submits that, as amended, claims 35-42 meet the patentability requirements of §101.

lee@hayes The Business of IP \*\*

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0009] Claims 1-42 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In light of the

amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot.

Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0010] Specifically, the Decision on Appeal addresses claims 1, 10, 16, and 35, as

being representative of the other claims. On page 10 of the Decision, the Board states:

the claimed "alert" reads on any electronically transmitted, user-requested

information; and

the claimed "alert sources" includes any source which can transmit information

electronically

[0011] Claim I has been amended to distinguish a centralized alert center from an

alert source, to clarify that the centralized alert center is not directly associated with the

alert source, to clarify that the alert source is configured to enable users to subscribe

directly to the alert source; to clarify that the centralized alert center acts on the user's

behalf to subscribe to and receive alerts from an alert source for the user, and to clarify

that the alert that is received on the user's behalf from the alert source is the same alert

that is forwarded to the user.

[0012] Applicant submits that <u>dependent claims 2-15</u> are allowable at least by

virtue of their dependence on claim 1. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-5 and 7-14 are

amended to maintain consistent language with independent claim 1, as amended. One or

more of these claims may also be allowable for one or more other independent reasons.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayia D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP \*\*

-28-

[0013] For example, regarding claim 10, the Board states that, "Although

Appellants' claim 10 requires a first and second delivery action, there is no requirement

that the delivery actions be different from each other." (Decision, page 13.)

[0014] Claim 10 has been amended herein to clarify that, "the second delivery

method is not the same as the first delivery method."

[0015] Independent claim 16 has been amended similarly as claim 1, to clarify

that:

each of the multiple alert sources is configured to enable users to

subscribe to receive alerts directly from the alert source; and

the centralized alert delivery system is configured as an intermediary

that enables a user to direct the centralized alert delivery system to

subscribe to receive alerts directly from the multiple alert sources on

behalf of the user, thereby enabling the user to receive alerts from the

alert source without providing any user contact information to the alert

source.

[0016] Applicant submits that <u>dependent claims 17-27</u> are allowable at least by

virtue of their dependence on claim 16. Furthermore, dependent claims 18-22 and 24-26

are amended to maintain consistent language with independent claim 16, as amended.

One or more of these claims may also be allowable for one or more other independent

reasons.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Alty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@hayes The Business of IP®

-29-

[0017] <u>Claim 28</u> is amended herein to recite elements similar to those recited in

claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 28 is allowable for reasons similar to

the reasons for which claim 1 is allowable.

[0018] Applicant submits that dependent claims 29-34 are allowable at least by

virtue of their dependence on claim 28. Furthermore, dependent claims 30 and 32-34 are

amended to maintain consistent language with independent claim 28, as amended. One

or more of these claims may also be allowable for one or more other independent reasons.

[0019] Claim 35 has been amended to recite elements similar to those recited in

claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 35 is therefore allowable for reasons similar to

those given above with reference to claim 1.

[0020] Applicant submits that <u>dependent claims 36-42</u> are allowable at least by

virtue of their dependence on claim 35. Furthermore, dependent claims 36-42 are

amended to maintain consistent language with independent claim 35, as amended. One

or more of these claims may also be allowable for one or more other independent reasons.

**Dependent Claims** 

[0021] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the

same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner

withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Serial No.: 09/887,413 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -0752US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee&hayes The Business of IP \*\*

www.foldinges.com 509 324 9255

### Conclusion

[0022] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before** issuing a subsequent Action. Please call or email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Representatives for Applicant

Kayla D. Brant (Kayla@leehayes.com; x242)

Registration No. 46576

Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com

Dated: 04/21/08